

Remarks

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-8, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent 4,846,075 Tupper, and Applicant also respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 9 and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tupper and United States Patent 6,530,454 Renton et al.

The present invention involves a fall arrest system having first and second locking cam elements 14 and 15 that pivot about a first axis 16. First and second two part links 18 and 19 are each respectively connected to the first and second locking cam elements about a respective second axis 14C and 15C. The two part links 18 and 19 are also rotatably connected to each other about a third axis 20 separated from the first and second axes. A connecting loop 22 slips freely over the two part links 18 and 19 and is connected as shown in Figure 3 to a safety lanyard for attachment to the user.

The fall arrest device is movable between a locked position as shown in Figure 5 where the first and second locking cam elements 14 and 15 grip the cable 11 to prevent movement and an unlocked position as shown in Figure 4 where the first and second locking cam elements allow movement of the fall arrest device along the cable 10. An applied force above a predetermined value such as when a fall occurs moves a part of one or the other of the two part link such as the two part link 19 shown in Figure 9 so as to descend with respect to the second axis. Such operation of the two part link with a part thereof descending relative to the second axis is an important feature of the fall arrest device as discussed in the specification beginning with the last paragraph on page 13 through the fourth paragraph on page 14. More specifically, this operation of the two part link which may be referred to buckling prevents the connecting loop 22 from moving to a position allowing release of the locking cams 14 and 15 as more specifically defined in the above referenced portion of the specification.

Neither the Tupper or Renton et al. patent references applied in the Office Action discloses or suggests a fall arrest device having the structure of the claimed invention as described

above. More specifically, the embodiment of Figures 6-10 on which the Examiner has relied in the Office Action does not have a pair of two part links which upon application of an applied force above a predetermined value to one two part links causes the buckling type action that causes a part of the two part link to descend relative to the axis that provides connection thereof to the associated locking cam.


In the Tupper reference, the stub axes 66 could be considered the first axis about which the contact members 64 and 65 are rotatable. If the connection of the adjacent inner ends of the straight links 72 and 73 by the hidden line connection shown in Figures 9 and 10 is considered to be the second axis, there is no link part that descends upon the application of a predetermined force since that hidden line pivotal connection also descends. In fact, upon moving from the unlocked condition of Figure 9 to the locked position of Figure 10, the links 72, 73 and 74, 75 move toward each other. Furthermore, if the pins 78 and 79 of Tupper are considered to be the second axis, there is no part of any two part link that descends relative to the second axis because the link moves in unison with pins 78 and 79.

Claims 2-15 of the present application more specifically define the fall arrest device of the invention and thus further distinguish over the prior art. For example, claim 2 recites the manner in which the movement of the two parts of a link moves the locking cam means toward its first locking position and claim 3 recites the manner in which the first and second locking cam means are mounted about a common axis. Likewise, claims 6-15 recite further structure that distinguishes over the Tupper and Renton et al. references.

For the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in an allowable condition such that it is appropriate to hereby respectfully its allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER ROBERT FLUX

By 
James A. Kushman
Reg. No. 25,634
Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 30, 2008

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351